

Area-Wide Soil Contamination
Task Force
Protective Measures Subgroup

November 7, 2002

Protective Measures Evaluation Tables

Major Changes to Tables

- Added 2-acre residential and 20-acre undeveloped scenarios
- Simplified, standardized, refined effectiveness ratings
- Clarified cost ratings and cost evaluation information
- Removed rankings within categories
- Added “Post No Trespassing Signs” measure
- Added detail to footnotes/explanatory text
 - E.g., Who pays?
 - E.g., “ecological risk” definition

PM Subgroup recommends:

- Approve Tables as “working drafts”
- Tables adequate to support TF discussion of PM recommendations
- Clarifications, more detail on PMs can continue to come forward during discussion of possible recommendations

Approach to recommendations

- Recommended PMs to be commensurate with level of contamination and types of exposures to ensure resources are targeted appropriately
- Layers of PM should be considered; use different approaches in different circumstances
- PM Foundation = broad-based education, information, and awareness-building; additional approaches recommended for specific circumstances, such as child use areas
- In circumstances where more than the foundation needed, use L-M-H approach to refine types of PMs considered

Education, Information, & Awareness-Building

Recommend:

- Broad-based education, information, and awareness-building
- Applies everywhere A-W contamination is likely
- Focus materials on:
 - What is A-W contamination?
 - Where are elevated levels likely to occur?
 - Tools individuals can use to:
 - understand likelihood of elevated levels at individual properties
 - implement individual or other PMs

Education, Information, & Awareness-Building, continued

Importance/Value of Recommendation:

- Perquisite for implementation of some PMs (such as BMPs)
- Demonstrates some effectiveness, practicality, low \$
- Educates about potential for exposure and response options so communities and individuals can make informed choices about what, if any, actions to take

Discussion Question:

- Should the Subgroup continue to discuss broad-based information, education, and awareness-building as a “foundational” recommendation?
- If not, what alternative “foundational” recommendations should the Subgroup use to frame its work?
- If yes, what guiding principles should the subgroup use in further refining the foundation?

What Situations Warrant Additional Protective Measures?

- Child use areas (schools, daycare, parks/playgrounds)
 - Existing residential neighborhoods
 - Land proposed for development as child use area
 - Land proposed for residential development
 - Environmentally-sensitive areas
 - *Others?*
-
- Within each situation, a L-M-H approach helps focus PMs considered

Discussion Questions:

- Is this a complete list of situations to consider? Additions?
- Does the L-M-H approach make sense for refining PM recommendations? If yes, what guiding principles should the subgroup use re: identification of L-M-H concentrations or criteria?

Additional Protective Measures for Child Use Areas

Recommend:

- Broad-based education, information, awareness-building, PLUS
- Soil sampling at child use areas where elevated levels of arsenic and lead are likely
- Results of soil sampling inform whether additional PM are needed
 - Relatively higher levels might warrant physical barriers or soil removal
 - Relatively lower levels might only warrant ongoing education or implementation of BMPs

Discussion Questions:

- Should the Subgroup continue discussions of these approaches for child-use areas?
- If not, what alternative approaches should the Subgroup discuss?

Subgroup Next Steps

- Refine recommendation on broad-based information, education, and awareness building
- Refine recommendations for child-use areas
- Consider what additional PM might be warranted in other specific situations
- Develop L-M-H approach as a way to focus PMs considered for specific situations